

III. REMARKS

Claim Status

Claim 1-5, 7-11 and 26-27 are active in the application. Claims 1, 5 and 8 have been amended.

Specification

The specification is objected to because Figures 9 and 10 do not correspond to the Brief Description of the drawing contained the specification.

Applicant inadvertently juxtaposed the description of the two drawings in the text and submits an amended page 16 of the specification to cure this problem.

Claim rejections - 35 USC 112 - second paragraph

Claims 1, 5, 7-10, 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 5 and 8 refer to "recombinant specific" receptors. It is not clear what is meant by "recombinant specific" or what distinguishes a "recombinant specific" G-protein coupled receptor from that which is not "recombinant specific".

Applicant inadvertently neglected to insert a comma between the words "recombinant" and "specific" and has amended the claim inserting the comma thus obviating this ground for rejection.

Claim 8 refers to a "potential recombinant specific G protein-coupled receptor". In that case, the G-protein-coupled receptor is not even required to be present or to be "recombinant specific". However, the independent claim 1 clearly requires a recombinant specific G protein-coupled receptor to be in the system.

Applicant has amended claim 8 to remove the word "potential" thus obviating this ground for rejection.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for the phrase "the olfactory receptors" in line 12. There is no antecedent basis for the article "the" when referring to olfactory receptors.

Applicant has deleted the word "the" in the claim thus obviating this ground for rejection.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 101, Product of Nature

Claims 1, 5, 7-10, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims read on a product of nature in that the claimed recombinant cell is not "isolated."

Applicant has amended the claims to limit them to isolated recombinant cells.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph deposit information

USSN: 10/577,094
Response to Office Action dated October 5, 2009
Atty Docket: 102790-211
Page 9

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Applicant is enclosing deposit information with this response thus obviating this ground for rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,

NORRIS McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By 

Serle Ian Mosoff
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 25,900

875 Third Avenue - 8th Floor
New York, New York 10022
Phone: (212) 808-0700
Fax: (212) 808-0844